

**Revised Draft  
Environmental Impact Statement  
General Management Plan**

---

**Death Valley National Park  
Inyo and San Bernardino Counties, California  
Nye and Esmeralda Counties, Nevada**

This *Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement / General Management Plan* presents the proposed management approach and two alternatives for the management of the 3.3 million-acre Death Valley National Park in the northeastern Mojave Desert in California and Nevada. Death Valley is the largest national park unit in the contiguous United States, created by Congress October 31, 1994 through the California Desert Protection Act (CDPA).

The first *1998 Draft Environmental Impact Statement / General Management Plan* was released for public review in September 1998. Eleven public meetings were conducted during the 127-day public review period. Based largely on public comments on that draft plan, the NPS made substantial revisions to the 1998 draft plan. Responses to written public comments on the 1998 draft plan are contained in a separate volume. This *General Management Plan* serves as the initial overall management strategy for the next 10–15 years under which more detailed activity or implementation plans would be prepared. As such, a general management plan is general rather than specific in nature, and focuses on purposes of the unit, its significant attributes, its mission in relation to the overall mission of the agency, what activities are appropriate within these constraints, and resource protection strategies. It also provides guidelines for visitor use and development of facilities for visitor enjoyment and administration of the unit.

The proposed action (alternative 1) seeks to extend the existing management strategies that are in place for the previous Death Valley National Monument, and the National Park Service mission and policies, to the management of the resources within the new lands added to the unit in 1994 by the California Desert Protection Act. It also strives to incorporate the designation of 95% of the Park as wilderness into the management approach. This alternative addresses the removal of feral burros and horses from the Park in order to achieve the NPS mission of managing the unit for native desert species. It also recognizes the need to work cooperatively with the Bureau of Land Management on adjacent land, where their mandate from Congress is to maintain viable herds of wild horses and burros. This alternative attempts to balance the preservation of resources mission with specific mandates from Congress at no more than the level occurring in 1994. In Death Valley, the California Desert Protection Act provides for the continuation of grazing on the new lands. This alternative addresses grazing as a component of the management. This plan identifies a number of activity level plans needed to address site specific issues, such as the Saline Valley Warm Springs management and a wilderness/backcountry management plan. This alternative seeks funding for acquisition of private property from willing sellers, and/or mineral interests where proposed uses conflict with the primary mission of preserving resources and providing for visitor enjoyment.

In addition to the proposal (alternative 1), two other alternatives in this document include the existing management (alternative 2) and an optional management approach (alternative 3). The existing management alternative describes the continuation of current management strategies. It is commonly referred to as the no action, or status quo alternative. Under this alternative, existing visitor and administrative support services and facilities would be maintained in their current locations. There would be no changes in existing number or location of structures. There would be no change in road maintenance, although some roads could be improved if funding becomes available. No changes in recreation use would occur. Land acquisition would focus on obtaining funds to acquire private property and mineral interests from willing sellers only where proposed uses conflict with the Park mission. The optional approach (alternative 3) provides for approval of the use of an airstrip at Saline Valley Warm Springs, designating campsites at the Warm Springs, specifies acquisition of private land or mineral interests only in sensitive habitats, and the phase out of the concession operation at Stovepipe Wells.

The 90-day opportunity for public comment starts with the Environmental Protection Agency filing a notice of availability in the Federal Register. Comments must be received by that time and should be sent to the following address:

Superintendent  
Death Valley National Park  
Death Valley, CA 92328



# CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
<b>PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PLAN .....</b>	<b>27</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	29
BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL PARK .....	29
MISSION .....	35
PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE .....	35
Death Valley National Park Purpose .....	35
Death Valley National Park Significance .....	35
PRIMARY INTERPRETIVE THEMES .....	36
MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES .....	36
Natural and Cultural Resources .....	36
Wilderness Values .....	37
Visitor Use .....	38
Interpretive Services .....	38
Recreational Activities .....	38
Commercial Services .....	38
Facilities and Services .....	39
Operations .....	39
Regional Planning and Cooperation .....	40
CARRYING CAPACITY .....	40
Desired Future Conditions .....	41
PLANNING ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS .....	45
NPS PLANNING PROCESS .....	45
ISSUE ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES .....	45
Issues Identified During Public Scoping .....	46
PLANNING CONSTRAINTS AND MANDATES .....	49
ACTIONS CONSIDERED FOR ALTERNATIVES BUT REJECTED .....	50
RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS .....	51
West Mojave Plan .....	52
Northern and Eastern Colorado Desert Coordinated Management Plan .....	52
Las Vegas Resource Management Plan .....	53
Spring Mountains National Recreation Area Plan .....	53
Fort Irwin Proposed Expansion .....	53
Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Disposal at Nevada Test Site .....	54
Timbisha Shoshone Homeland .....	55
FUTURE PLANNING EFFORTS .....	55
<b>ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION .....</b>	<b>57</b>
OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES .....	59
ALTERNATIVE 1: PROPOSED ACTION .....	60
GENERAL DESCRIPTION .....	60
NATURAL RESOURCES .....	63
Physical Environment .....	63
Biological Environment .....	68
Fire Management .....	70
Research .....	71
Inventorying and Monitoring .....	71
CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	72
NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS .....	73
VISITOR USE, SERVICES, AND FACILITIES .....	74
Interpretation .....	74
Information/Orientation .....	75

Visitor Facilities .....	76
Recreational Activities .....	78
Visitor Use Fees .....	82
Commercial Services .....	82
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS .....	83
Scotty' s Castle.....	83
Furnace Creek and Cow Creek.....	83
Grapevine .....	83
Stovepipe Wells.....	84
Wildrose.....	84
ROADS AND CIRCULATION .....	84
Roads .....	84
Trails .....	84
Signs .....	85
ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES.....	85
Park Administration .....	85
Employee Housing .....	85
Solid Waste Disposal.....	86
LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE.....	86
Park Boundary and Authorized Acreage.....	86
Wilderness .....	86
Land Acquisition .....	88
Mineral Development Activities .....	88
Abandoned Mines .....	91
Sand and Gravel for Road Maintenance .....	91
Cattle Grazing.....	93
PLAN IMPLEMENTATION .....	96
Operational Costs .....	96
ALTERNATIVE 2: EXISTING MANAGEMENT (NO-ACTION).....	98
GENERAL DESCRIPTION .....	98
NATURAL RESOURCES.....	98
Physical Environment.....	98
Biological Environment.....	98
Fire Management.....	100
Research.....	100
Inventorying and Monitoring .....	100
CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	101
NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS .....	102
VISITOR USE, SERVICES , AND FACILITIES.....	102
Interpretation .....	102
Information/Orientation.....	102
Visitor Facilities .....	102
Recreational Activities .....	103
Visitor Use Fees .....	103
Commercial Services .....	104
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS .....	104
ROADS AND CIRCULATION .....	104
Roads .....	104
Trails .....	105
Signs .....	105
ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES.....	105
Park Administration/Employee Housing.....	105
Solid Waste Disposal.....	105
LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE.....	106
Park Boundary and Authorized Acreage.....	106
Wilderness .....	106
Land Acquisition .....	106
Mineral Development Activities .....	106
Abandoned Mines .....	107
Sand and Gravel Use for Road Maintenance.....	107

Cattle Grazing .....	107
PLAN IMPLEMENTATION .....	108
ALTERNATIVE 3: OPTIONAL MANAGEMENT APPROACH.....	110
GENERAL DESCRIPTION .....	110
VISITOR USE, SERVICES, AND FACILITIES.....	110
LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE .....	110
Land Acquisition .....	110
Mineral Development Activities .....	110
PLAN IMPLEMENTATION .....	111
Operational Costs .....	111
<b>AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>113</b>
NATURAL RESOURCES .....	115
PHYSICAL RESOURCES.....	115
Air Quality and Visibility .....	115
Night Sky .....	116
Noise.....	116
Water .....	117
Paleontological Resources .....	119
Geologic Resources .....	120
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	121
Vegetation.....	121
Wildlife .....	121
Species and Habitats of Special Consideration .....	126
CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	132
ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	132
Pleistocene Era.....	132
Lake Mojave Period.....	132
Pinto Period .....	132
Gypsum Period .....	133
Saratoga Springs Period.....	133
Shoshonean Period.....	134
Historic Archeology .....	134
Status of Archeological Research .....	134
Landforms and Archeological Resources.....	135
National Register of Historic Places.....	135
HISTORIC RESOURCES .....	135
Exploration .....	136
Transportation .....	137
Mining .....	138
Ranching/Homesteading.....	140
Federal Administration.....	141
Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) .....	142
Recreational Development/Tourism.....	142
Timbisha Shoshone Village .....	143
Warm Springs – Saline Valley .....	143
Cultural Landscapes .....	144
National Register of Historic Places.....	145
Museum Collection.....	146
RELATIONSHIPS OF NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURES TO THE DEATH VALLEY AREA .....	147
VISITOR USE, SERVICES, AND FACILITIES .....	149
OUTDOOR RECREATION .....	149
VISITOR INFORMATION CENTERS .....	151
CAMPGROUNDS .....	152
BACKCOUNTRY CAMPING.....	153
COMMERCIAL SERVICES .....	153
SOCIOECONOMIC DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING AREA .....	155
LOCAL AND REGIONAL COMMUNITIES.....	155

PARK COMMUNITY .....	156
OTHER RESIDENTS .....	156
ROADS AND CIRCULATION.....	158
ROADS .....	158
TRAILS .....	158
ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES .....	160
FACILITIES.....	160
Furnace Creek/Cow Creek.....	160
Scotty’ s Castle.....	160
Maintenance Facilities .....	160
HOUSING.....	160
LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE.....	162
STATE LANDS.....	162
WILDERNESS .....	162
MINING .....	162
PRIVATE LANDS.....	162
GRAZING.....	162
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES .....</b>	<b>165</b>
ALTERNATIVE 1: PROPOSED ACTION .....	167
IMPACTS ON NATURAL ENVIRONMENT .....	167
IMPACTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	168
IMPACTS ON NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS .....	169
IMPACTS ON VISITOR USE AND FACILITIES .....	169
IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS .....	170
IMPACTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES .....	170
IMPACTS ON LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE.....	171
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....	172
ALTERNATIVE 2: EXISTING MANAGEMENT .....	173
IMPACTS ON NATURAL ENVIRONMENT .....	173
IMPACTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	176
IMPACTS ON NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS .....	177
IMPACTS ON VISITOR USE AND FACILITIES.....	177
IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS .....	178
IMPACTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES .....	178
IMPACTS ON LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE.....	178
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....	179
ALTERNATIVE 3: OPTIONAL MANAGEMENT .....	181
IMPACTS ON NATURAL ENVIRONMENT .....	181
IMPACTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	181
IMPACTS ON VISITOR USE AND FACILITIES.....	181
IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS .....	181
IMPACTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES .....	181
IMPACTS ON LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE.....	181
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....	182
OTHER COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS.....	183
SUSTAINABLE AND LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT .....	185
<b>CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>187</b>
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT .....	189
PUBLIC SCOPING AND WORKSHOPS .....	189
COMMENTS ON THE 1998 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN .....	190
NEWSLETTERS AND HOMEPAGE .....	190

AGENCY CONSULTATION .....	191
NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION .....	193
DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL PARK ADVISORY COMMISSION.....	193
INVITED COOPERATING AGENCIES.....	194
LIST OF AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE DRAFT PLAN WERE SENT.....	195
<b>APPENDIXES .....</b>	<b>199</b>
APPENDIX A: CALIFORNIA DESERT PROTECTION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 103-433).....	201
APPENDIX B: LAND PROTECTION PLAN FOR DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL PARK.....	213
APPENDIX C: SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONSIDERATION .....	272
APPENDIX D: NATIONAL PARK SERVICE BIOSPHERE RESERVE PROGRAM .....	286
APPENDIX E: PRINCIPLES FOR WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT IN THE CALIFORNIA DESERT .....	294
APPENDIX H: TERM AND CONDITIONS OF A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR GRAZING LIVESTOCK.....	311
PREPARERS.....	317
ACRONYMS AND GLOSSARY .....	318
REFERENCES .....	327
INDEX .....	334

## FIGURES

1. Region.....	31
2. Place Names .....	33
3. Park Boundary and Preliminary Wilderness .....	61
4. Saline Valley Warm Springs .....	81
5. Landownership.....	89
6. Mining Claims and Inactive Mines .....	92
7. Cattle Grazing Permit (1994) .....	95
 B-1. Landownership .....	 245
B-2. Mining Claims .....	247
B-3. Known Water Rights .....	248
B-4. Grazing Allotments .....	249

## TABLES

1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives.....	3
2: Summary of Impacts .....	19
3: Proposed Action Cost Summary .....	96
4: Death Valley National Park Existing Staffing.....	109
5: 1994 Water Use at Death Valley National Park.....	118
6: BLM's Wild Horse and Burro Herd Management Areas for Herds Adjacent to Death Valley National Park.....	124
7: Burro and Wild Horse Population Data .....	124
8: Death Valley National Park Annual Visitation .....	149
9: Death Valley National Park Visitor Activities .....	150
10: Death Valley National Park Visitor Profile.....	151
11: Population of Communities that Surround The Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Area, 1980–1996.....	156
12: Average Daily Traffic Levels (1995) .....	158



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This *Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement / General Management Plan* evaluates alternative management approaches for Death Valley National Park in the northeastern Mojave Desert of California and Nevada. Death Valley was redesignated as a national park on October 31, 1994 through the passage of the California Desert Protection Act. Congress expanded the previous Death Valley National Monument by 1.3 million acres, designated 95% of the area as wilderness (3,158,038 acres), and designated the unit a national park. This impact statement is one of three documents prepared for the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Area as part of an interagency coordinated planning effort. The *Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement / General Management Plan* for Mojave National Preserve and the *California Desert Conservation Area Plan* amendment for the Bureau of Land Management lands were projected to be released at about the same time as this document.

As a recently expanded unit of the national park system, the Park's existing management plans are outdated. This planning effort will produce a general management plan that will serve as the overall management strategy for the next 10–15 years. More detailed activity or implementation plans will be prepared under this plan. The general management plan is general in nature, rather than specific, and focuses on purposes of the unit, its significant attributes, its mission in relation to the overall mission of the agency, what activities are appropriate within these constraints, and resource protection strategies. It also provides guidelines for visitor use and development of facilities for visitor enjoyment and administration of the unit.

The impetus for this plan was the passage of the California Desert Protection Act on October 31, 1994. This act transferred over 3 million acres of the California desert from the Bureau of Land Management to the National Park Service and designated nearly 8 million acres of wilderness on NPS and BLM lands. In addition, the act created the Mojave National Preserve and redesignated Death Valley and Joshua Tree national monuments as national parks. Changes in the management of the public lands in the California desert, including listing of the desert tortoise, increasing development, public use pressures, and passage of the California Desert Protection Act, caused NPS, BLM, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) desert managers to address the anticipated changes in management of these federal lands by looking at management issues beyond traditional boundaries. Three sub-regional planning teams were established in the desert region of southern California: the West Mojave Plan in the western Mojave Desert, the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort in the northern and eastern Mojave Desert, and the Northern and Eastern Colorado Planning Effort in the northern and eastern Colorado Desert. These teams would gather information, define issues, and develop methods for issue resolution. The National Park Service, which manages most of the land in the northern and eastern Mojave Desert, took the lead for the Northern and Eastern Mojave interagency planning effort. The other participating agencies are the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Bureau of Land Management is the lead for the West Mojave Plan and the Northern and Eastern Colorado Planning Effort. The planning region boundaries for all three areas will cease to exist when the planning efforts are completed.

The Northern and Eastern Mojave planning team conducted twenty public meetings in September 1995 and April 1997 to gather public input on the management direction for the planning area. From this input, meetings with interested parties (such as county departments, special interest groups, California Department of Fish and Game, etc.) and discussions with agency staff, a proposed management plan for Death Valley was developed. This proposed plan (alternative 1) is compared with the existing management or the no-action alternative (alternative 2), and with a third optional management approach (alternative 3). Table 1 provides a summary of the actions examined under each alternative. Table 2 is a summary of the primary effects of each action.

The *1998 Draft Environmental Impact Statement* was released for public review in September 1998. Eleven public meetings were conducted during the 127-day public review period. Responses to written public comments on the 1998 draft plan are addressed in a separate volume. More public meetings will be held after this document's release. Responses to comments on the revised draft plan will be addressed in the final environmental impact statement. Thirty days after release of the final environmental impact statement a record of decision will be produced. Soon after the record of decision a summary general management plan and land protection plan for the Park will be released. These documents will be summary presentations of the management direction arrived at through the public process.

**TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
<b>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend existing Park management strategies and NPS mission and policies to management of resources within new lands added the Park.</li> <li>Protecting resources and providing for visitor enjoyment are primary goals.</li> <li>Balance this mission with the other Congressional mandates, such as maintaining appropriate grazing and mining under NPS regulations, and continue existence of major utility corridors.</li> <li>Manage Park in a manner to perpetuate the sense of discovery and adventure.</li> <li>Activity level plans needed to address site specific issues are identified.</li> <li>Look to adjacent communities to provide most support services and facilities.</li> <li>Seek funding for purchase of property from willing sellers based on priorities identified in the “Land Protection Plan.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow the existing management approach under <i>1989 General Management Plan</i> and other site-specific planning including the <i>1983 Natural and Cultural Resource Management Plan</i>. These actions are typically referred to as the “status quo” or no action alternative, since this is what would occur if no planning was undertaken.</li> <li>Most of the actions continue policies that are now being followed.</li> <li>New Park lands added in 1994 would continue to be managed under NPS policy and regulations and an interim operations strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as the proposed action, except for differences noted below for “Visitor Use, Services, and Facilities” and “Landownership and Use.”</li> </ul>
<b>NATURAL RESOURCES</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update <i>Natural and Cultural Resource Management Plan</i> to include lands and resources added in 1994.</li> <li>Priority determined through the <i>Strategic Plan</i>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manage resources according to enabling legislation and NPS regulations and policies.</li> <li><i>Natural and Cultural Resource Management Plan</i> in place.</li> <li>Prepare a strategic plan annually.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Air Quality/ Visibility/Night Sky/Noise</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participate in adjacent land use planning and monitor the visual, air, and night sky resources.</li> <li>Continue air-monitoring program.</li> <li>Prepare guidelines for developed areas to establish visual consistency and themes in facility development.</li> <li>Preserve natural quiet and sounds associated with the physical and biological resources of the Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active air monitoring program.</li> <li>Participate in a national air quality network and monitor ozone and particulate matter.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Water Resources</i>	<b>Water Rights:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Park has affirmative responsibility to protect federal reserved water rights.</li> <li>Maintain proactive water rights protection program including participation in regional water</li> </ul>	<b>Water Rights:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary survey of outstanding waters rights has been developed.</li> <li>Monitor regional water rights issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>management activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Park would apply principles under Section 706 of the California Desert Protection Act to manage and protect federal reserved water rights.</li> </ul> <p><b>Water Use:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use water efficiently and frugally.</li> <li>Continue water-monitoring program.</li> <li>Assertively compile baseline data on Park's water and water-related resources.</li> <li>Maintain productive water resources management program.</li> <li>Continue to monitor Devils Hole water elevation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Floodplains/ Wetlands:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Occupancy and modification of floodplain and wetland areas would be avoided wherever possible.</li> </ul> <p><b>Water Developments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine use of water developments (guzzlers, livestock tanks, and troughs). Keep developments benefiting native vegetation and wildlife.</li> <li>Begin restoring natural water sources.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Water Use:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul> <p><b>Floodplains/ Wetlands:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul> <p><b>Water Developments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance of existing livestock tanks and troughs allowed with Superintendent's authorization.</li> </ul>	
<i>Paleontological Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to encourage research of Park paleontological resources.</li> <li>Seek to obtain a comprehensive geologic map coverage of the Park to delineate geologic areas of paleontological resources.</li> <li>Increase interpretive program to include paleontological resources.</li> <li>Continue to patrol backcountry and protect sensitive areas through public closures where appropriate.</li> <li>Develop comprehensive inventory, monitoring, and database programs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cooperate with researchers to identify paleontological resources.</li> <li>Most scientific research conducted by entities other than National Park Service.</li> <li>Protect resources through random patrols of backcountry, as well as limited public closures to protect sensitive sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Geological Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect and monitor geological features.</li> <li>U.S. Geological Survey would map renowned exposed geology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Cave Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect cave resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
<i>Sensitive Species</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect sensitive species by considering them in all compliance actions.</li> <li>• Continue to manage and protect the 40-acre Devils Hole and its endangered pupfish.</li> <li>• Prepare a plan for the Eureka Dunes area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Introduced Species</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No introducing nonnative plants and animals.</li> <li>• Undertake management actions, including eradication of exotic species.</li> </ul> <p><b>Burro and Wild Horse Management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt the “no burro” strategy that exists for the former monument lands for the new Park lands.</li> <li>• The National Park Service will work with the Bureau of Land Management and the California Department of Fish and Game on feasibility studies that involve boundary fences.</li> <li>• Remove burros and wild horses by a multi-phased approach including live capture, adoption, and possible direct reduction of last remaining animals to reach a zero population level. Phases can be run concurrently in different parts of the Park.</li> </ul> <p><b>Nonnative Vegetation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue removal of tamarisk, Russian thistle, and hornwort.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No introducing nonnative plants and animals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Burro and Wild Horse Management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management of burros in the former monument is in the final phase of a three-phased program, with a goal of zero burros. This phase involves the removal of burros by animal protection groups at their expense. This option is being exercised by these groups to avoid implementation of a shooting policy. On new lands added to the Park, the National Park Service has entered into an interim agreement with the Bureau of Land Management to manage the area at previous BLM herd management levels until this management plan is completed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Nonnative Vegetation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Disturbed Land Restoration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perpetuate native plant life as part of natural ecosystem.</li> <li>• Landscapes and plants might be manipulated to maintain habitat for threatened and endangered species.</li> <li>• Disturbance caused by natural causes would not be modified unless conditions presented safety or resource protection concerns.</li> <li>• Cultural zones would be managed as a historic landscape.</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of abandoned mine sites would continue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Fire Management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formulate desert fire management strategy.</li> <li>• Continue assessment of existing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1990 Fire Management Plan goals are: Allow fire, as an ecosystem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>fire effects research in desert ecosystems and develop new fire management strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiate research burns within specific prescriptions and monitor burn sites to assess changes.</li> <li>• In cooperation with other desert parks, other federal and state land managers, and the research staff in the agency or at universities, fire-related research needs would be identified and long-term studies initiated.</li> <li>• Based on the results of fire management research, the Park would periodically revise its "Fire Management Plan."</li> </ul>	<p>process, to resume its natural role to the appropriate practical extent.</p> <p>Provide for rapid, aggressive and safe suppression of all fires that do not meet management objectives.</p>	
<i>Research</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as existing management, with research emphasis provided by CDPA and 1998 NPS Omnibus Act.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Park uses a multi-faceted process to initiate the accumulation of scientific knowledge.</li> <li>• Studies may be conducted with in-house expertise and funding, and funding with outside Park assistance (both money and people).</li> <li>• Park resource information needs are defined within the Park's <i>Resource Management Plan</i>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Inventorying and Monitoring</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated <i>Natural and Cultural Resources Management Plan</i> would present a detailed program for managing resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Cultural Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and implement program to identify, inventory, interpret and nominate archeological sites, historic properties, cultural landscapes, and ethnographic resources to National Register of Historic Places. Finish national register nominations.</li> <li>• Develop and implement a systematic applied cultural resource research program to ensure: (1) adequate baseline information on location, condition, threats, and significance/integrity of resources; (2) accurate interpretation and preservation treatment of resources; and (3) the use of appropriate means to manage, protect, preserve, and interpret Native American heritage or other ethnographic resources.</li> <li>• Update <i>Natural and Cultural Resources Management Plan</i> to address the requirements, projects,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current emphasis on compliance efforts to meet requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act, Director's Order #28: Cultural Resource Management (1998), and the <i>NPS Management Policies</i>.</li> <li>• Present cultural resource management programs: (1) data collection and inventory of archeological sites, ethnographic resources, and historic properties; (2) intermittent updating of the list of classified structures; and (3) cultural resource studies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>and funding to implement the cultural resource program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop collaborative partnerships with government agencies, Timbisha Shoshone Tribe, and public and private organizations that have cultural resource management or research capabilities or expertise.</li> </ul>		
<b>NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1989 General Management Plan management strategy is out of date. The current approach is cooperation and collaboration between the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe and the National Park Service and as appropriate, other USDI agencies.</li> <li>One of the most significant elements of collaboration is the study of land suitability conducted between the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe and the Department of the Interior. The draft report, "The Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Homeland (1999)," contains the recommendations of the joint Federal-Tribal negotiating team responsible for carrying out the suitability study.</li> <li>The study recommends the transfer of 319 acres at the current Furnace Creek Village site to the Tribe in trust.</li> <li>The study also recommends to seek designation of an area primarily in the western part of the Park as the Timbisha Shoshone Natural and Cultural Preservation Area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<b>VISITOR USE, SERVICES AND FACILITIES</b>			
<i>Interpretation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop comprehensive interpretive plan to replace outdated "Interpretive Prospectus (1990)."</li> <li>Continue interpretive services wherever NPS staff can effectively meet with the public to increase their understanding and appreciation of Park resources.</li> <li>Expand interpretation regarding Native American activities.</li> <li>Expand interpretation efforts to areas outside the Park.</li> <li>Cultural resource sites that are easily accessible and historically important would be treated as significant interpretive stops.</li> <li>The Park would increase efforts to inform the public, particularly in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to use "Interpretive Prospectus (1990)" for interpretive guidance and planning.</li> <li>Continue upgrading interpretive waysides within the Park in accordance with a wayside exhibit plan prepared by Harpers Ferry Center.</li> <li>Wayside exhibits would be developed for key features along heavily traveled corridors within recently acquired lands.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>backcountry locations, that all historical and archeological objects are protected under federal law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Park would continue to seek additional ways to improve the living history program or other methods of interpreting Scotty's Castle.</li> <li>• To ensure the protection of especially fragile natural and cultural values, resource management specialists, interpretive planners, and designers would work together to develop ways for visitors to see the resources without causing unacceptable damage.</li> </ul>		
<i>Information/ Orientation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to provide information at heavily visited areas, such as Furnace Creek visitor center, Scotty's Castle, and all ranger stations.</li> <li>• Continue managing staffed information/fee collection stations in Beatty, Nevada and at Stovepipe Wells.</li> <li>• Develop unstaffed orientation/information stations ("reception centers") along the Park's five major entrance roads in association with proposed and existing fee collection stations.</li> <li>• Provided information via Park internet homepage.</li> <li>• Post signs or exhibits at key intersections.</li> <li>• Provide basic orientation information 24 hours using a variety of methods such as lighted exhibits, brochure dispensers, audio, permanent and portable information.</li> <li>• Use minimal on-site information/interpretive services such as signs and interpretive exhibits in the backcountry.</li> <li>• Continue to upgrade interpretive wayside exhibits in accordance with a wayside exhibit plan.</li> <li>• Cooperate with other agencies and organizations to make information available along approach routes to the Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information at existing visitor facilities.</li> <li>• Continue to provide visitors with information at ranger stations (Grapevine, Beatty, Stovepipe Wells, and Wildrose) and operate with volunteer staff as available.</li> <li>• Continue supporting multi-agency information center at Lone Pine.</li> <li>• Continue to assist visitors approaching the Park from I-15 at Mojave National Preserve's Baker visitor center.</li> <li>• Provided information via Park internet homepage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Visitor Facilities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Park staff would consider creative ways to increase the recreational opportunities for visitors with disabilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue managing major visitor centers at Furnace Creek and Scotty's Castle.</li> <li>• Provide ranger stations at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action except for developed campgrounds.</li> </ul>



Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entrance stations are planned for State Highway 190 on the east and west sides of the Park.</li> <li>The existing Grapevine Ranger Station would continue as an information station that is staffed as staff and funding allows.</li> <li>Continue to operate major visitor centers at Furnace Creek and Scotty's Castle, and support interagency information centers.</li> <li>Improve interpretive displays at Furnace Creek visitor center and provide more displays to include information on recently acquired lands.</li> <li>Provide comprehensive design packages for visitor facilities that would strive to balance resource protection with visitor access and safety, minimize impacts on sensitive resources, and improve the visual quality of the areas and overall visitor experience.</li> <li>Provide improvements at key attractions such as Badwater or especially sensitive natural and/or cultural resources such as Eureka Dunes and Devils Hole to protect resource values.</li> </ul> <p><b>Developed Campgrounds:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve existing campgrounds by reducing safety hazards, better defining and separating sites, improving restrooms, and adding amenities such as newer picnic tables.</li> <li>Redesign all RV campgrounds to meet national fire codes that allow a maximum of 30 RVs per acre.</li> <li>Redesign the Sunset, Texas Spring, Stovepipe Wells, and Furnace Creek campgrounds to accommodate average winter demand and improve camping conditions.</li> </ul>	<p>Grapevine, Wildrose, Shoshone, and Beatty.</p> <p><b>Developed Campgrounds:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently maintain nine developed campgrounds offering approximately 1,500 campsites.</li> <li>Smaller campgrounds or parts of campgrounds may be eliminated if situations arise where threats to visitor health and safety can not be mitigated.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Developed Campgrounds:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as existing management except, close Emigrant campground because of the flood hazard.</li> </ul>
<i>Recreational Day Use Activities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support day use activities that are compatible with Park management objectives and current visitor needs.</li> <li>Continue to prohibit recreational activities that would involve or result in: Inconsistency with the Park's enabling legislation or proclamation, or derogation of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>the values or purposes for which the Park was established</p> <p>Unacceptable impacts on visitor enjoyment due to interference or conflict with other visitor use activities</p> <p>Inappropriate Consumptive use of Park resources</p> <p>Unacceptable impacts on Park resources or natural processes</p> <p>Unacceptable levels of danger to the welfare or safety of Park visitors, including participants.</p>		
<i>Backcountry and Roadside Camping</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish small, primitive campsites in some remote areas of the Park to offer alternative camping experiences.</li> <li>Designate specific campsites in some areas to protect sensitive resources.</li> <li>Complete wilderness/ backcountry management plan to provide specific guidance.</li> <li>Currently there are over 400 miles of backcountry roads that are open to camping with an unknown number of informal campsites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Backcountry Cabins</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visitors can use cabins on a first-come, first-served basis according to interim management direction. Limit length of stay to 30 days annually.</li> <li>Prepare a survey and conduct inventory of cabins within the Park.</li> <li>Possibly revise management direction for some structures according to results of inventory.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Visitor Use in Saline Valley</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A site specific management plan to create a strategy for management of the area consistent with NPS mandates and policies would be prepared in consultation with interested public through the NEPA process.</li> <li>The plan would address protection of natural and cultural resources, exotic species, public health and safety, and environmental restoration, environmental and social carrying capacity of the land, and designation of the site as a backcountry campground and the appropriate number and development of sites.</li> <li>The following would limit the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Saline Valley Warm Springs has vault toilets, fire grills, shower, soaking tubs and picnic tables that have been installed and maintained by the public using the springs.</li> <li>No site planning.</li> <li>Roadside camping is allowed. Vehicle use around springs not restricted.</li> <li>The Park's 30-day annual camping limit applies.</li> <li>The Saline Valley Road is maintained by Inyo County.</li> <li>A volunteer camp host provides some visitor services and communications with the Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All areas within the Eureka-Saline wilderness road corridor would be open for roadside camping.</li> <li>Designated car camping sites would be established in the area of springs with a minimal amount of other improvements to be considered within a site plan.</li> <li>No airstrip would be permitted; this would require a special regulation in 36CFR as well as adequate safety and maintenance work.</li> <li>Road maintenance,</li> </ul>

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>scope of the activities permitted at the springs:</p> <p>Soaking tubs/spas would be limited to the current level of improvements.</p> <p>The Upper Springs would continue to be protected from human improvements and use and from burros.</p> <p>The Saline Valley Road would be maintained to its current surface condition by Inyo County.</p> <p>An analysis will be made of the Chicken Strip airstrip to determine whether to retain it under 36CFR or whether it should be closed due to safety and/or resource impact concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed site plan will also consider options for the active restoration of the upper springs to a natural condition.</li> <li>• Depending upon future use levels and priorities, the National Park Service could consider maintaining some of the facilities at the springs.</li> <li>• The National Park Service would work with groups associated with the springs, to manage this place in a manner where all members of the public feel welcome.</li> <li>• The National Park Service would not actively promote expanded public use of the springs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chicken Strip airstrip remains open, but is not designated as such per USDI standards.</li> <li>• The Tail-Dragger airstrip is closed.</li> </ul>	<p>between Saline Valley Road and Lower Warm Springs, trash pick up and removal, toilets and all other maintenance functions at the warm springs would continue to be done by user groups under agreements with the Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A volunteer camp host system would continue to provide visitor services.</li> </ul>
<i>Visitor Use Fees</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to the methods currently employed and being developed, the Park would explore the possibility of fee collection by third parties.</li> <li>• The National Parks Pass are sold at all national parks and over the internet via several retail partners.</li> <li>• Entrance fees are presently collected at the Furnace Creek visitor center, the Grapevine Entrance Station, Beatty, Stovepipe Wells, and Baker.</li> <li>• Entrance and information stations will be constructed at east and west Park boundaries on Highway 190.</li> <li>• Filming and incidental business permits would continue to be granted on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entrance fees are presently collected at the Furnace Creek visitor center, the Grapevine Entrance Station, Beatty, Stovepipe Wells, and Baker.</li> <li>• Fees are also collected at the developed campgrounds.</li> <li>• Filming and incidental business permits would continue to be granted on a case-by-case basis.</li> <li>• Commercial tour buses are charged an entrance fee based on the seating capacity of the bus.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commercial tour buses are charged an entrance fee based on the seating capacity of the bus.</li> </ul>		
<i>Commercial Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No major changes to current commercial services.</li> <li>Continue current concession contract providing lodging, a restaurant and bar, gift shops, general store, and gas service at Stovepipe Wells and food service, a gift shop, and gasoline at Scotty's Castle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stovepipe Wells offers visitors general services such as lodging, food, gasoline, and a small market, while Scotty's Castle provides food, gasoline and a gift shop.</li> <li>The Park works cooperatively with the owners of Panamint Springs Resort and with Amfac Resorts, which owns and operates commercial services at Furnace Creek, but does not have any authority over management of these commercial services.</li> <li>The Park has no plans for new commercial services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<b>GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A historic resources study, cultural landscape report and a development concept plan for Scotty's Castle would be prepared.</li> <li>A development concept plan for administrative and visitor facilities at Furnace Creek and administrative facilities at Cow Creek would be prepared as a combined document.</li> <li>Complete development concept plan for the Grapevine area which is underway to address the following:  Employee housing would be improved and temporary facilities would be eliminated.  Some NPS and concessioner employees now residing at Scotty's Castle would be relocated to Grapevine. A small community building and recreation facilities would be provided. Some maintenance functions could be relocated from Scotty's Castle.  Museum-quality items now stored in various buildings at Scotty's Castle would be moved into a climate-controlled structure at Grapevine or another location within or outside the Park to provide the most appropriate storage.</li> <li>Stovepipe Wells would be renovated in accordance with updated site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A development concept plan for Stovepipe Wells was completed in 1980 and is being updated.</li> <li>A development concept plan for Cow Creek was completed in 1984.</li> <li>A development concept plan for Grapevine is underway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>management plan:</p> <p>The existing campground would be redesigned.</p> <p>The ultimate number of RV hookup campsites will be determined.</p> <p>A paved section of the existing airstrip would be converted for helicopter use. The remainder of the airstrip would be converted to a gravel strip and not be used as an overflow camping area.</p> <p>Landscaping would utilize native species and would depend on water availability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A site plan would be developed for the Wildrose area.</li> </ul>		
<b>ROADS AND CIRCULATION</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current road management plan for the Park would be reevaluated because of changes in visitor use patterns, increased number of buses entering the Park, the addition of more roads from Park expansion and a need to readjust maintenance priorities in reaction to funding levels.</li> <li>• The plan would determine such things as the status of duplicate road sections, road surface conditions and the appropriate level of maintenance.</li> <li>• The National Park Service would propose to Caltrans that Highway 190 would be realigned at Stovepipe Wells.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently, the Park maintains 243 miles of paved roads, 300 miles of maintained dirt roads, and 100–200 miles of unmaintained dirt roads.</li> <li>• California State maintains Highway 190 that traverses the Park. Highway 190 is designated as a national scenic byway.</li> <li>• Inyo County maintains about 75 miles of paved and non-paved roads in the Park.</li> <li>• Little or no maintenance is performed on high clearance and four wheel drive backcountry roads. However, emergency repairs may be undertaken following flash floods.</li> <li>• Vehicle use in the Park is limited to street legal vehicles and no offroad driving is permitted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Trails</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as existing management with the addition of installing trailhead orientation signs at all key trailheads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wilderness/backcountry management plan would address trail use by hikers, equestrian, bicycles, and people with disabilities.</li> <li>• Hikers are allowed on all open trails, while most backcountry trails are open to stock use.</li> <li>• Heavily used pedestrian walks or trails are not open to stock use.</li> <li>• Bicycles are not allowed on trails or in wilderness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
<i>Signs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep same philosophy as in existing management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sign philosophy is to keep signs unobtrusive and to blend with the natural environment.</li> <li>Keep secondary or backcountry roads with minimal directional, instructive, or interpretive signs.</li> <li>Construct new signs only to keep visitors from becoming lost and allow the backcountry roads to remain lightly traveled.</li> <li>Provide maps and other mediums to reduce need for signs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES</b>			
<i>Park Administration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative headquarters for the Park are currently located at Furnace Creek. The NPS structures there were built in the 1960s and are inadequate for existing staff or storage needs. Water is a critical limiting factor in the Furnace Creek area.</li> <li>Several historic Civilian Conservation Corps-era adobe structures at Cow Creek provide limited additional space for offices.</li> <li>The Park also maintains satellite field offices at Scotty's Castle and Stovepipe Wells.</li> <li>Currently, there are Park operations offices located outside the Park at Beatty, Shoshone, and Owens Valley.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Park headquarters, administrative, resource management, visitor and resource protection, interpretive, and maintenance staff, buildings, and employee housing would remain in the existing Furnace Creek, Cow Creek, Grapevine, Scotty's Castle, Stovepipe Wells, and Wildrose areas of the Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Employee Housing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of the Park staff live at the Cow Creek housing area. There are about 60 housing units and 37 transient trailer/RV sites at this location.</li> <li>California Department of Transportation, California Highway Patrol, elementary school employees, and the Natural History Association director occupy nine additional units constructed and maintained by them.</li> <li>The development concept plan underway for the Grapevine area would recommend providing housing and replacing the existing trailers for the northern district of the Park. Ongoing trailer replacement with permanent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of the Park staff live at the Cow Creek housing area. As of 1998, there are 60 housing units and 37 transient trailer sites at this location.</li> <li>Ongoing development concept plan at Grapevine would consider trailer and housing replacement at that location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>houses would continue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transient trailers and RVs are allowed in designated NPS areas, but not permanently placed trailers.</li> <li>• Prior to constructing additional housing for employees, the Park would evaluate the location of the housing and make a determination about whether private housing elsewhere within a one hour drive could serve the same need, and whether the total housing units are the minimum necessary to meet the mission of the Park</li> </ul>		
<i>Solid Waste Disposal</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as existing management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solid waste disposal is hauled to an approved landfill outside of the Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as existing management.</li> </ul>
<b>LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Park would continue to regulate nonfederal rights on federal lands through existing laws and regulations, while pursuing acquisition.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Park regulates nonfederal rights on federal lands through existing laws and regulations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Park would continue to regulate nonfederal rights on federal lands through existing law and other regulations, while pursuing acquisition in sensitive areas.</li> </ul>
<i>Park Boundary</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical and drafting errors may be corrected; otherwise, no changes in the boundary of the Park are proposed.</li> <li>• Park acreage approximately 3,396,172.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final boundary map and legal description submitted to Congress.</li> <li>• Park acreage approximately 3,396,172.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Wilderness</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage wilderness for maximum statutory protection, per California Desert Protection Act.</li> <li>• Approximately 95% of the Park designated wilderness.</li> <li>• Prepare wilderness/backcountry management plan.</li> <li>• For each non-emergency entry, the grazing allottee may enter Park wilderness, under certain conditions, with a motorized/mechanized vehicle or use motorized equipment with permission from the Superintendent.</li> <li>• Emergency entry (imminent danger of loss of livestock, severe facility damage, an injured person requiring transport, or a life-threatening situation) with a motorized/mechanized vehicle and/or requiring the use of motorized equipment must be reported before or just after it occurs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> <li>• Recommendations of the wilderness/backcountry management plan would be implemented.</li> <li>• Wilderness management focused on overflights, horse patrols, and backcountry road patrols on open wilderness corridors to identify illegal uses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Wilderness Act generally prohibits motorized equipment or mechanized transport in designated wilderness areas; however, it allows them “as necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act.”</li> </ul>		
<i>Land Acquisition</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A land protection plan would provide direction for land acquisition.</li> <li>The Park Service would seek funds to acquire private lands and interests in the Park.</li> <li>Private land at Furnace Creek and Panamint Springs would be acquired if requested by the owners.</li> <li>Donations and exchanges are pursued from willing sellers and third party acquisitions from willing sellers are encouraged.</li> <li>Exchange of state school sections would continue per CDPA direction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPS purchase of private lands and interests in the Park is not an ongoing or active program.</li> <li>Donations and exchanges are pursued from willing sellers, and third party acquisitions from willing sellers are encouraged.</li> <li>Exchange of state school sections ongoing per CDPA direction.</li> <li>A draft land protection plan was prepared in the mid-1980s but was never finalized. The draft plan has been updated to reflect the addition of the new land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action, except: Private lands or interests would only be acquired on an opportunity basis if the Park Service were approached by a landowner wanting to sell, the interest was located in a sensitive area, or a development project would adversely affect Park resources.</li> <li>Exchange of state school sections ongoing per CDPA direction.</li> </ul>
<i>Mineral Development Activities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as existing management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The California Desert Protection Act withdrew the Park from all location, entry and patent under the mining laws, and from mineral and geothermal leasing and mineral materials sales, subject to valid existing rights.</li> <li>National Park Service would regulate mineral development on valid mining claims in accordance with 36 CFR Part 9A. Where proposed development fails to meet 9A approval standards and no alternative development scenario is feasible, the National Park Service would initiate acquisition.</li> <li>Whenever a proposed mineral development fails to meet the regulatory approval standards and no alternative development scenario is feasible, the National Park Service would seek funding to initiate acquisition of the mineral rights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Park Service would prepare a minerals management plan that analyzes sensitive resource values and the potential impacts of likely mineral development scenarios. Where mineral development would significantly conflict with resource values, the Park Service would seek funding to acquire the mineral rights.</li> <li>Until funds were appropriated, proposed mining operations would be evaluated under NPS regulations at 36 CFR Part 9A as under existing management.</li> </ul>
<i>Abandoned Mines</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The National Park Service would seek funding to complete an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General information of abandoned mine lands for the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>



Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>abandoned mineral lands inventory on the expanded Park lands and develop reclamation plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Death Valley would implement remediation, stabilization, and restoration program on abandoned mineral land sites, as funding is available.</li> </ul>	<p>old Monument area is provided in the “1981 Historic Resources Report” by Greene and Latschar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A preliminary inventory of abandoned mining properties on the new lands was generated from existing information in the U.S. Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines databases.</li> <li>Additional detailed surveys would be conducted to provide more detailed information on the abandoned mineral properties parkwide.</li> <li>Appropriate stabilization, reclamation, and hazardous material clean-up would be carried out after development plans and environmental and cultural resources compliance had been completed, and, as funding was available.</li> </ul>	
<i>Sand and Gravel for Road Maintenance</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of borrow materials for road maintenance would be evaluated in road management plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building materials, (sand, gravel, cinder, etc.) geo-thermal resources and oil and gas on federal lands are not available for extraction or sale.</li> <li>Use of borrow materials for road maintenance must conform to existing NPS policy that requires materials to be obtained from nonpark sources, unless economically infeasible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as existing management.</li> </ul>
<i>Grazing/Range Management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No grazing is permitted on the former Monument lands.</li> <li>Grazing privileges would continue to be managed under existing allotment management plans, NPS regulations, policies, Park management direction, and special use permits at no more than the level as of October 31, 1994.</li> <li>The small portions of the Eureka Valley and Lacey-Cactus-McCloud allotments that the Park acquired would be closed to grazing.</li> <li>An allotment management plan would be prepared by the National Park Service for the remaining grazing allotment.</li> <li>The California Desert Protection Act directs the Secretary to make the acquisition of “base property”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grazing is not permitted within the former monument.</li> <li>The California Desert Protection Act provides that the privilege of grazing cattle on lands within the Park shall continue to be exercised at no more than the current level as of October 31, 1994, subject to applicable NPS regulations, policies and Park management direction.</li> <li>Four allotments totaling over 2700 animal unit months (AUMs).</li> <li>Fees would be based on allotment schedules and NPS Special Use Permit costs.</li> <li>Restrictions on grazing use would be based on resource conditions, visitor safety and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

	<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
	<p>from willing sellers a priority above all other acquisitions in the Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fees would be based on allotment schedules and NPS Special Use Permit costs.</li> <li>• Restrictions on grazing use would be based on resource conditions, visitor safety and wilderness values.</li> <li>• The Superintendent has the discretion to lower grazing levels, as necessary to respond to resource protection needs, visitor safety, or wilderness values.</li> <li>• National Park Service would allow appropriate maintenance of existing range developments. Ranchers would normally be required to access wilderness on foot or horseback, similar to other users.</li> </ul>	<p>wilderness values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Superintendent has the discretion to lower grazing levels, as necessary to respond to resource protection needs, visitor safety, or wilderness values.</li> <li>• National Park Service would allow appropriate maintenance of existing range developments. Ranchers would normally be required to access wilderness on foot or horseback, similar to other users.</li> </ul>	
<b>PLAN IMPLEMENTATION</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This <i>Environmental Impact Statement / General Management Plan</i> identifies further activity level planning needed to guide management of the Park.</li> <li>• Phased schedule provided for additional planning.</li> <li>• Burro removal, salt cedar removal, and the development of a grazing management plan to begin immediately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities for allocation of staff and funding determined on a year by year basis using the strategic planning process.</li> <li>• Strategic plan sets five-year planning goals that could be revised and adjusted yearly.</li> <li>• Staff and funding adjusted as needed to place resources where most appropriate to meet the demands.</li> <li>• Activity level planning would be pursued, with most of the identified plans being completed within the next five years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<i>Staffing and Funding</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in Park operating base of \$1.7 million and 37 staff needed to fully implement <i>General Management Plan</i>.</li> <li>• Implementation of developments and improvements estimated at \$25.7 million.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park FY 00 operating base is \$5,337,000.</li> <li>• Existing staffing is 108 and operating budget is \$5.4 million.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

**TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
<b>IMPACTS ON NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When burros are removed from Death Valley National Park and as grazing allotments are phased-out or reduced, there would be a reduction of disturbed soils.</li> <li>• A Saline Valley site management plan would reduce adverse impacts on soils and would provide a better opportunity for the disturbed soil's recovery.</li> <li>• Vegetation consumption and trampling would diminish with the removal of burros and the removal of cattle as grazing is phased-out or reduced.</li> <li>• During burro capture operations there could be some localized, short-term disturbance to vegetation from the capture crews and their equipment during the capture operation.</li> <li>• Removal of exotic plants will provide increased opportunities for native vegetation to recolonize areas and recover.</li> <li>• A Saline Valley site management plan would reduce adverse impacts on vegetation and would provide a better opportunity for the recovery of the area's natural vegetation.</li> <li>• Wilderness designation of 95% of the Park will provide increased vegetation protection.</li> <li>• The removal of burros from the Park and the phasing out of grazing would eliminate their adverse impacts on the Park waters. Springs and creeks would no longer be contaminated by burro wallowing, defecation, or urination.</li> <li>• As burros are removed from the Park and as cattle grazing is phased-out or reduced, wildlife populations would benefit from less competition for resources.</li> <li>• As natural water sources are restored, wildlife populations would adjust to more natural condition.</li> <li>• Studies would be undertaken to determine if guzzlers have contributed to unnaturally high wildlife populations and possible overuse of native vegetation.</li> <li>• Localized populations of wildlife may be disturbed for short periods of time during the burro capture operations. No long-term adverse impacts on wildlife from these operations would be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The major negative impacts to the natural environment are due to the presence of burros and tamarisk. These impacts include: damage to soil crusts, reduced water infiltration, inhibit nitrogen fixation in desert plants, provide a favorable seed bed for exotic annuals, soil compaction, destruction to natural springs, and destruction to native vegetation.</li> <li>• Vegetation is affected to varying degrees by non-native burros, tamarisk, and by unrestricted camping activities like at Saline Valley.</li> <li>• Burros are known to contaminate water sources (through defecation and urination), over-browsing, elimination of aquatic and riparian vegetation and monopolizing the use of springs or seeps.</li> <li>• Developed water (guzzlers, mining, and livestock water developments) may be affecting native wildlife populations by allowing some populations to grow to levels unobtainable with available natural water.</li> <li>• Mining or agriculture activities on private or state lands and mining claims could negatively impact natural resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action, except:</li> <li>• The desert environment would not be restored near the Chicken Strip.</li> <li>• Designation of campsites at Saline Warm Springs would result in less damage to the landscape and would have a positive impact for the desert environment. An approach of minimal development would limit impacts upon natural resources from construction but minimal controls on visitor use would allow for an increase in the degree of impacts related to human use of the area, if visitor use increases.</li> </ul>

PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)	EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)	OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3)
<p>expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the establishment of wilderness in 95% of the Park, additional protection to wildlife populations would be predicted.</li> <li>• With the enactment of proposed inventory and monitoring programs the status and of the effects of the proposed programs on vegetation and wildlife will be better known.</li> <li>• Most of the lands proposed for the Timbisha Shoshone Homeland are outside the Park, but some adverse impacts are anticipated on natural resources in the Furnace Creek area as a result of development for housing, tribal offices and recreation facilities and possible inn and cultural museum. These developments would be subject to the NEPA process.</li> <li>• Traditional tribal activities on cooperative special use areas are not predicted to result in adverse impacts to native plant communities or special status species. Wildlife may benefit from habitat restoration and management activities.</li> <li>• Anticipated water usage at the site would be 92 acre feet, which would be acquired through conservation measures and be subject to availability and securing an allocation subject to valid existing rights.</li> </ul>		
<b>IMPACTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archeological resources, historical properties, cultural landscapes and ethnographic resources would benefit from an expanded systematic inventory, research and preservation program.</li> <li>• Reduced damage to archeological resources with burro removal and active management of the cattle allotments.</li> <li>• The draft LEIS for the Timbisha Shoshone Homeland proposal predicts significant advantages and improvements to the condition of cultural resources as a result of the creation of tribal homeland and the improvement in collaboration and cooperation between the Tribe, the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management.</li> <li>• Development of a site management plan for the Saline Valley area would identify cultural resources and recommend methods to protect and interpret them.</li> <li>• Additional mining related cultural</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural resources are potentially threatened by burro and cattle trampling and by visitor camping, vandalism, illegal acts such as artifact collecting or driving near isolated and unprotected sites.</li> <li>• Historic properties listed on, or determined eligible for listing on, the national register would continue to be afforded stabilization / preservation treatment as funding allows.</li> <li>• Impacts from recreational use on cultural resources in the Warm Springs area of Saline Valley are unknown, but potentially significant.</li> <li>• The Park Service is unable to protect historic and archeological features on private lands against decay and vandalism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>

Table 2: Summary of Impacts

PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)	EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)	OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3)
resources potentially important to the history of the Park could be acquired.		
<b>IMPACTS ON NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPS commitment to positive and productive government-to-government consultation and collaboration with tribal representatives, including the current land suitability study and other subjects of common interest would maintain positive relationships with the Tribe and help resolve some long-standing issues.</li> <li>• Development of mutually satisfactory approaches to concerns between the Tribe and the Park Service will increase the ultimate cooperation between the Tribe and the Park Service. Expanded cooperation and collaboration would provide significant benefits to both the Park and the Tribe.</li> <li>• The Tribe would be able to pursue construction of additional housing and other amenities to provide a more suitable situation for Tribal members.</li> <li>• Implementation of provisions of the Homeland Study would result in positive impacts to Native American interests.</li> <li>• Greater collaboration and cooperation between the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe, the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management are predicted as a result of the creation of a tribal homeland. This would in turn result in opportunities to address cultural resource needs and expand interpretive perspectives for visitors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informal communication works well on many issues. A more structured process, however, might well result in greater opportunities for collaboration and cooperation.</li> <li>• Native American interests could be better identified and considered in Park decision making.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action.</li> </ul>
<b>IMPACTS ON VISITOR USE, SERVICES, AND FACILITIES</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As burro numbers are reduced, there would be fewer opportunities to see burros in the Park. Some people would be upset over the direct reduction of the last few burros.</li> <li>• To others, as the damaged habitat recovers, seeing fewer burros would be viewed as a positive impact.</li> <li>• Most of the proposed Timbisha Shoshone Homelands are outside the Park, but future development at Furnace Creek for housing, tribal offices and recreation facilities and a possible inn and cultural museum would be consistent with existing commercial development and the desire to improve visitor opportunities at Furnace Creek. The proposal would likely improve visitor facilities and opportunities in the Park.</li> <li>• Traditional tribal activities on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some visitor's experience would be affected by viewing cattle ranching, burros, mining, guzzlers, and stock tanks.</li> <li>• Saline Valley's existing management would continue, with consequent natural and cultural resource impacts.</li> <li>• The Saline Valley Road would continue to get occasional maintenance from Inyo County.</li> <li>• The Chicken Strip airstrip would remain open, but not designated as such, per USDI standards.</li> <li>• Visitors would encounter mining development activities, sometimes in designated wilderness, that may appear to some as a conflict with the Park's conservation purpose.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action, except:</li> <li>• The Chicken Strip airstrip would remain open for planes and would be so designated under 36CFR.</li> </ul>

<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
<p>cooperative special use areas (gathering of plants, use of springs, and maintenance of mesquite groves) are not predicted to result in adverse impacts to visitor use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved collaboration and cooperation with the Tribe would create opportunities to address cultural resource needs and expand interpretive perspectives for visitors.</li> <li>• The potential inn and cultural museum developments would create some options for lodging and would provide visitors with a perspective on Native Americans and their heritage that is presented from the perspective of the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe.</li> <li>• Access for people with disabilities to trails and campsites would improve their opportunities for use of the campgrounds.</li> <li>• Changes proposed for the Saline Valley area with an increased NPS presence in the area's operations and maintenance may seem to create too structured an operation to some within the Saline Valley Warm Springs advocate group.</li> <li>• An analysis of the Chicken Strip will be done to determine if it should remain open.</li> <li>• Increased NPS management in the Saline Valley would help maintain its qualities by protecting the resources from potential increases in visitation and unmanaged visitor activities.</li> <li>• As private and state lands are purchased, more public lands would be available for visitor use and less incompatible development activities would occur in the Park.</li> </ul>		
<b>IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</b>		
<p>A separate analysis of socioeconomic conditions in the planning area and the effects of the proposed action was conducted by Dean Runyan Associates under contract to the National Park Service. That analysis concluded that no significant effects would occur in the Northern and Eastern Mojave planning area as a result of the proposed action. There would be some loss of grazing related jobs if allotments were acquired, but the overall effect would be offset by an increase in tourism jobs.</p> <p>Implementation of the Timbisha Shoshone Homeland proposal would generate minor socioeconomic effects locally and regionally, including placing additional demands on local services, to removing over 7,000 acres from BLM ownership, causing a small decline in BLM fees paid to counties. Positive effects on the tribe's socioeconomic environment is the desired outcome of the legislation and are predicted to occur over a number of years as a result of revenue generating activities. Major social benefits include the ability of the tribe to live on their own lands in modern communities, with access to traditional use areas, in association with the tribal homelands.</p>		
<b>IMPACTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burro removal would increase short-term Park costs and staff time (about \$410,000 not counting staff time).</li> <li>• Grazing fees use would be limited to resource management projects and management of the grazing program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The estimated cost for capture, transporting, adoption preparation and adoption for 51 burros per year would average about \$61,000.</li> <li>• There are significant additional costs for trespass burros that enter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action, except:</li> <li>• No airstrips would be permitted.</li> </ul>

Table 2: Summary of Impacts

PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)	EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)	OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Saline Valley, funding would be needed to make campsite improvements, to provide facilities and resource protection, to develop a site management plan, for increased maintenance costs, and for the Chicken Strip study.</li> <li>• With the possible relocation of some NPS services outside of the Park, there would be increased transportation time and expenses for employees who have to work in the Park.</li> <li>• Housing opportunities would increase for employees living outside the Park, and demand on Park housing would not increase.</li> <li>• Although most of the proposed Timbisha Shoshone Homelands are outside the Park, future development at Furnace Creek for housing, tribal offices and recreation facilities and a possible inn and cultural museum would create a slight increase in workload for Park staff over the short term for compliance purposes. Traditional tribal activities on cooperative special use areas would create a small additional workload for permitting and monitoring purposes.</li> <li>• There would be a large initial administrative workload and cost to acquire properties. However, this workload would diminish over time as nonfederal lands and interests are brought under public ownership.</li> </ul>	<p>the Park from adjacent BLM herd management areas and from burro reproduction of 20% per year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are minor costs for administering wilderness access and guzzler maintenance.</li> <li>• Grazing fees collected under the existing management are not sufficient to manage a grazing program. Additional funding would be needed.</li> <li>• Campground administration support would be continued with staff and volunteers managing campgrounds.</li> <li>• National Park Service would have to tolerate the undesignated Chicken Strip airstrip.</li> <li>• With the addition of new lands workloads would increase, limiting the Park Service's ability to serve the public and protect resources.</li> <li>• Some employee housing would remain inadequate and below reasonable standards.</li> </ul>	
<b>IMPACTS ON LANDOWNERSHIP AND USE</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotment management plans would replace the BLM plan (Hunter Mountain Allotment) and provide management direction for the Last Chance Allotment.</li> <li>• Under NPS management, grazing fees might be increased.</li> <li>• The change in grazing management operations with the chance of more grazing limitations, control of nonnative species and higher grazing fees might influence the future value of the grazing allotments.</li> <li>• The receiving communities of new NPS offices and employees may see an increase in property values and an increase in demand for community services and utilities.</li> <li>• Impacts on mineral development activities would be the same as the existing management alternative.</li> <li>• Implementation of the Timbisha</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burros continue to use ranchers' water and forage allocated for cattle.</li> <li>• The Park would regulate nonfederal rights through existing laws and regulations.</li> <li>• Purchases of nonfederal properties are not actively pursued, but may occur on an opportunity basis from willing sellers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as proposed action, except:</li> <li>• Private land or interests would only be acquired in sensitive resource areas from willing sellers, or if a development project would adversely affect Park resources.</li> <li>• Increased acquisition of mineral rights would occur as a result of the sensitive resource analysis and the identification of areas where mineral development would be incompatible with the Park mission.</li> </ul>

<b>PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)</b>	<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)</b>	<b>OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3)</b>
<p>Shoshone Homeland proposal would result in the transfer of 314 acres of federal land inside the Park to be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for the Tribe, as well as approximately 120 acres of private land in Saline Valley. There would also be an additional 7,240 acres of BLM managed lands transferred and held in trust. These lands would be for the exclusive use of the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe and would no longer be available for general public use, except as authorized by the Tribe. Some of these lands would be converted from conservation status to development status by virtue of the anticipated economic developments.</p>		
<b>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The acquisition of grazing allotments on a willing-seller willing-buyer basis and removal of most of burros in Death Valley National Park would contribute to the overall restoration of the desert's vegetation, soils, waters, and wildlife to more natural conditions.</li> <li>• There would be less overall development of desert habitat and resources on a regional basis.</li> <li>• There would be a reduction in the burro populations within the California desert area's public lands.</li> <li>• Impacts to burros from the potential loss of habitat and a possible increase in the number of injuries or deaths may result from the increased activities at two sites near the Park (the proposed expansions at the National Training Center at Fort Irwin and the expected expansion of the Briggs Mine).</li> <li>• The potential reduction in tax dollars is partially mitigated by payments in lieu of taxes that are paid to the counties for lands acquired by the federal government. Additionally, occupancy and sales taxes have and would continue to grow.</li> <li>• The growth in tourist dollars spent on food, lodging, transportation, and other items expended in the area is expected to continue.</li> <li>• The existing withdrawal of some Park land from mineral entry over the last twenty years by the Mining in the Parks Act, the Bureau of Land Management for wilderness study areas or other purposes, and by the California Desert Protection Act, has removed some areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining wild horse and burro herd at the NPS units and BLM land, as well as the concurrent burro management with the Bureau of Land Management's other planning efforts, Clark County, Nevada, the Navy's China Lake, and Inyo and San Bernardino National Forests would increase the number of burros available for adoption, significantly increasing management costs and the problems of finding homes for the burros.</li> <li>• The effects of burro and cattle grazing on the soil, water, flora, and fauna are major and cumulative. Restoration of the California desert is inhibited while these animals remain.</li> <li>• Increases in animal populations (domestic, feral, and native) due to availability of water by fabricated devices might cause regional adverse effects (use of more resources at a faster rate than can be replaced) on the desert ecology.</li> <li>• Cumulative impacts on archeological sites, ethnographic resources, and historic properties are difficult to analyze with precision.</li> <li>• It is presumed that degradation caused by erosion, casual collection, and deterioration to features is more likely to happen when large groups of people are at an archeological site.</li> <li>• Growth of administrative facilities is limited due to availability of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as the proposed action</li> </ul>



Table 2: Summary of Impacts

PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1)	EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2)	OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3)
<p>of the desert from potential mineral development except for valid existing rights in those areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on the commodity, small regional price increases could result from increased transportation or development costs in other areas. The price of gold, the primary mineral sought, would not be affected by any actions in the planning area. Any loss of jobs in one sector is expected to be offset by stable and sustainable growth in jobs in the service and tourist industries.</li> <li>There would be no adverse cumulative impacts on cultural resources under this alternative.</li> <li>Implementation of the Timbisha Shoshone Homeland proposal would result in 7,554 acres of public lands (314 acres are within the Park) being transferred and held in trust for the Tribe. These lands would be for the exclusive use of the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe and would no longer be available for general public use, except as authorized by the Tribe.</li> <li>Although these lands don't currently receive a large amount of public use, this loss of public lands could be viewed by some as contributing to the perceived loss of access to public lands that occurred by the designation of wilderness.</li> <li>Development on these transferred lands would contribute incrementally to other ongoing activities in the area, including mining, economic developments at the Nevada Test Site, population growth in Pahrump and anticipated developments in the planned Science and Technology Corridor in Nye County, Nevada.</li> </ul>	<p>water and with natural resources receiving priority of use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are believed to be only a few warm springs in the California desert that have native flora and fauna intact. This condition would not be improved under this alternative.</li> <li>Development of mining claims and state lands in the Park could contribute to overall loss of desert resources and habitat for native species in the region. Potential road closures by claimants during active mining could result in a small additional decrease in overall public access.</li> <li>The existing withdrawal of some Park land from mineral entry over the last twenty years has removed some areas of the desert from potential mineral development, except for valid existing rights. Depending on the commodity, small regional price increases could occur from increased transportation or development costs in other areas if properties are denied operating permits due to regulatory standards and are purchased. The price of gold, the primary mineral sought, would not be affected by any actions in the planning area.</li> <li>Any loss of jobs in one sector is expected to be offset by stable and sustainable growth in jobs in the service/tourist industry.</li> </ul>	

